

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 4, 7, 10 and 13 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 2, 3 and 9 have been previously canceled. Thus, claims 1, 4-8 and 10-20 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

Informal Matters

In the Office Action mailed May 21, 2007, claims 4-7 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4 and 10, as well as claims 7 and 13, which depend from claims 4 and 10, respectively, have been amended responsive to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome the objections and rejection, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action mailed May 21, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-8, 10-13 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,452,004 to Roberts, (hereinafter, "Roberts"). Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,827,348 to Ernest et al. (hereinafter, "Ernest"); and claims 17-19 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of Ernest and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,382,974 to Soeda et al. (hereinafter, "Soeda"). It is noted that claims 4, 7, 10 and 13 have been amended. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses the rejections, as follows.

In making this rejection, the Examiner asserts that Roberts discloses each and every feature of the claimed invention. However, as explained in the response filed on February 20, 2007, Roberts discloses a random access imaging device, which has a random access function.

The invention as recited in independent claims 1, 14 and 20 includes the feature of a row shift circuit including a row read scan circuit capable of supplying a read signal to said plurality of row selection signal lines sequentially, and a reset scan circuit capable of supplying a reset signal to said plurality of reset signal lines sequentially, **the row shift circuit having no random access function**.

Thus, Roberts does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Moreover, the Applicant notes that the structure of the claimed invention is capable of attaining the functions of Roberts, but, because the row shift circuit of the claimed invention has **no random access function**, the structure thereof is simplified considerably as compared to the structure of the **random access circuit** of Roberts.

Similarly, neither Ernest nor Soeda discloses or suggests at least the combination of a row shift circuit including a row read scan circuit capable of supplying a read signal to said plurality of row selection signal lines sequentially, and a reset scan circuit capable of supplying a reset signal to said plurality of reset signal lines

sequentially, the row shift circuit having no random access function, as recited in independent claims 1, 14 and 20.

For at least these reasons, as well as the reasons set forth in the February 20, 2007 Response, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 14 and 20, are allowable over Roberts.

As claims 1 and 14 are allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 4-8 and 10-19, which depend from allowable claims 1 and 14, respectively, are likewise allowable over Roberts.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this

communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number **107317-00026**.

Respectfully submitted,


Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Reg. No. 41,668

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

WC/MLC: